

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the case. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-8 and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Markus et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,490,601, hereafter referred to as Markus, in view of Daswani et al., hereafter referred to as Daswani. Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-8 and 10-14 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Markus in view of Daswani for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to amended independent Claim 1, which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A method for providing transaction processing in a palmtop computer, comprising:

using a file server to process wireless queries and interface between said palmtop computer system and the Internet wherein the palmtop computer accesses Internet resources using said file server as an intermediary;

storing a personal information database on the file server that contains personal information data relating to a user of the palmtop computer;

storing a site map database on the file server that contains data which maps fields of the personal information database to frames of known Web clippings;

receiving a wireless request from a palmtop computer to populate frames of a selected Web clipping;

retrieving personal information data from the personal information database for fields mapped to the frame in the selected Web clipping in the site map database; and

transmitting wirelessly the retrieved personal information to the palmtop computer.

Independent Claim 10 recites similar limitations. Claims 2-8 that depend from independent Claim 1, and Claims 11-14 that depend on independent Claim 10 provide further recitations of the features of the embodiments of the present invention.

Markus and the claimed invention are very different. Applicant understands Markus to teach a server system for automatically inserting data into electronic forms (Abstract). Markus teaches away from the embodiments of the present invention by teaching an end user computer that is a stand-alone computer with access to the Internet and contains an Internet browser program and a browser window (col. 7 lines 29-33). In addition, Markus teaches the process of automatic form completion beginning with a user downloading the form from a web site (Col. 7 lines 41-42). In contrast, embodiments of the claimed invention are directed towards a method for providing transaction

processing in a palmtop computer that is not directly connected to the Internet.

Serial No 09/541,378

Art Unit: 3486

Examiner: Nguyen, Thu Ha T

Further, the claimed limitations of the present invention access forms from a file server for processing wireless queries and for interfacing between a palmtop computer system and the Internet wherein the palmtop computer accesses Internet resources using said file server as an intermediary, as claimed.

The claimed limitations of the present invention specify a file server that interfaces the palmtop computer with the Internet and provides the forms to the end computer system without the end computer system downloading the forms from the Internet. Markus actually teaches away from the claimed limitations of the present invention by teaching an end user computer with an Internet connection and Internet browser to download forms from the Internet (Column 7 lines 27-33). The palmtop computer of the present invention may not comprise resources sufficient to download forms from the Internet. Instead, the claimed limitations of the present invention utilize a file server to interface the palmtop computer with the Internet and to provide web clippings that can be automatically filled. The end computer system is not directly connected to the Internet and does not download forms from the Internet, as taught by Markus.

The cited combination fails to teach or suggest the claimed embodiments because Daswani fails to remedy the deficiencies of Markus. Daswani may purport to teach a system comprising a wireless network coupled to the Internet by a data center. However, Daswani fails to teach or suggest “wherein the

palmtop computer accesses Internet resources using said file server as an intermediary,” as claimed. Daswani actually teaches away from this limitation of the embodiments of the present invention by teaching the end computer system directly connected to the Internet.

Specifically, Daswani teaches “the data request in some cases may be manually initiated by a user, and in some cases a request will be automatically initiated when the device connects to the Internet,” (column 7 lines 12-16). Daswani and the embodiments of the present invention are very different. The device of the present invention is not directly connected to the Internet and uses the file server to utilize Internet resources. The device of Daswani is directly connected to the Internet and utilizes Internet resources on by itself.

Applicant respectfully asserts that nowhere does Markus alone or in combination with Daswani teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1 and 10, and that these Claims are thus in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Markus alone, or in combination with Daswani also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 2-8 which depend from independent Claim 1 and Claims 11-14 which depend from independent Claim 10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-8

and 10-14 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markus in view of Rai U.S. Patent No. 6,421,714, hereafter referred to as Rai, further in view of Daswani. Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 9 and 15-20 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Markus in view of Rai, further in view of Daswani.

As described above, Markus alone, or in combination with Daswani, and the claimed invention are very different. Markus actually teaches away from the claimed limitations of the present invention by having the end computer system download forms directly from the Internet. The embodiments of the present invention retrieve personal information data from the personal information database for fields mapped to the frame in the selected Web clipping in the site map database, as claimed. The embodiments of the present invention does not download forms from the Internet, as taught by Markus.

Daswani also teaches away from the claimed invention by teaching the end computer system directly connected to the Internet. The claimed limitations

of the present invention teach an interface between the Internet and the end computer system. As claimed, the end computer system is not directly connected to the Internet. Rai may teach wireless access to the public Internet (col. 2 line 36), however does not remedy the deficiencies in Markus and Daswani. Rai fails to teach or suggest “wherein the palmtop computer accesses Internet resources using said file server as an intermediary,” as claimed.

Applicant disagrees that Daswani teaches a file server configured to be an interface between said palmtop computer system and the Internet wherein the palmtop computer utilizes Internet resources using said file server as an intermediary and sending wireless request from a palmtop computer system, as claimed. Specifically, as stated above, Daswani fails to teach “wherein the palmtop computer utilizes Internet resources using said file server as an intermediary,” because Daswani teaches the end computer system directly connected to the Internet.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Markus, Daswani and Rai teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 10 or 16 and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Markus taken in combination with Rai and further in combination with Daswani does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in

Claim 9 which depends from independent Claim 1, Claim 15 which depends on independent Claim 10 and Claims 16-20 which depend from independent Claim 15. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9 and 15-20 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION


In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the amended Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections and objections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: May 11, 2008


Anthony Murabito
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060